

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/522,826 | 07/21/2005 | Viktor Menart | LB/G-32991A/LEK | 4902 | |
| 83721 Lek (Slovenia) | 7590 01/20/201 - LUEDEKA, NEELY | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| P.O. BOX 187 | 1 | STOICA, ELLY GERALD | | | |
| Knoxville, TN 37901 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1647 | • | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 01/20/2010 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--------------------|---------------|--|
| 10/522,826 | MENART ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| ELLY-GERALD STOICA | 1647 | |

| y pp | Examine | ALCOIN | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | ELLY-GERALD STOICA | 1647 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 28 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | | | | |
| ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 4_months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In | | | | | | |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TO | | | | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee to action; or (2) as | | | |
| | brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41 | 37 must be filed with | in two months of | | | |
| 2. Q The Notice of Appeal was filed on 28 <u>December 2009</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | |
| ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ∑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | | lucing or simplifying t | he issues for | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | ected claims. | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mnliant Amendment (| PTOL-324) | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | inpliant Americanient (| 102-324). | | | |
| | Development of each of the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s): would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the | | | | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). | owabie ii subiliitted iii a separate, t | intery med amendmen | it canceling the | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1.5-7.10.12-17.19-21 and 23-26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail | s to provide a | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but In the claims 12, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, the wording "combination of the claims 43 and 44 there are placed in the method that are | ation of thereof" would necessitate | further consideration. | Also, in the new | | | |
| claims 43 and 44 there are steps in the method that are answered to in the final rejection | missing. The arguments of Applica | in were largely repetit | ive and were | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | /Lorraine Spector/ | | | | | |

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: In the claims 12, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, the wording "combination of thereof" would necessitate further consideration.